

THE REMONSTRANCE

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, JULY, 1919

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, West Virginia, Texas, Florida, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other Publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of
Massachusetts

One hundred and fifty-eight Branch Committees; 41,635*
members in 443 cities, towns, and villages

MRS. RANDOLPH FROTHINGHAM, President	
MRS. JOHN BALCH	} Vice-Presidents
MRS. A. H. PARKER	
MRS. JAMES D. COLT	
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ	} Honorary Vice-Presidents
MISS ANNA L. DAWES	
MRS. LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM	
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD	
MRS. CURTIS GUILD	
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL	
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL	
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY	
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer	
Walnut Street, Brookline	

Education and Organization Committee
Chairman

MISS M. LOUISE BROWN

Membership Committee
Chairman

MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

Legislative Committee

Chairman

MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Public Interest League

President

MRS. B. L. ROBINSON

College Anti-Suffrage League
President

MRS. HERBERT LYMAN

Recording Secretary

MRS. FRANK FOXCROFT

Corresponding Secretary

MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG

*Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State

MEMBERS ARE EARNESTLY REQUESTED TO KEEP HEADQUARTERS ADVISED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS.

WE OPPOSE THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

BECAUSE

The purpose of the Amendment is to override the free action of the several States, and to force woman suffrage upon States whose voters have rejected it at the polls by huge majorities.

BECAUSE

The Amendment is framed to enable the suffragists to carry their point by cajoling, lobbying and pestering legislators, without submitting this revolutionary change to the vote of the people, at any stage.

BECAUSE

The result in Massachusetts would be that a State which, less than four years ago, rejected woman suffrage by a nearly two-to-one majority, would have woman suffrage forced upon it through the action of the Legislatures of Wyoming, Idaho, Montana, Nevada and other suffrage States.

BECAUSE

In these days, when a large part of the world is tumbling toward chaos and Bolshevism, it would be an act of madness to reenforce Socialism — which is first cousin to Bolshevism — by granting woman suffrage. It should be remembered that the leading Socialist organ in this country declares that "Socialism without Woman Suffrage is an impossibility."

BECAUSE

The adoption of woman suffrage through a Federal Amendment is an irrevocable act. When woman suffrage is given through State action, it is possible to recall it, through like action; but the repeal of woman suffrage, conferred by Federal action, would be impossible.

BECAUSE

The great majority of women have never asked for the suffrage, and do not want it. The suffragists themselves virtually concede this fact, as is shown by the strenuous opposition which they always make to any proposal to test it by a referendum to women.

BECAUSE

Woman suffrage would more than double the ignorant, untrained, irresponsible and purchasable vote, and would force upon conscientious, intelligent and patriotic women the unwelcome necessity of taking time and strength needed for normal cares to withstand the forces of corruption and evil.

BECAUSE

In States where women have been voting for years, there is no evidence that their votes have brought about a better order of things. The election in Chicago last April, where the women helped to re-elect for four years a Mayor whose administration has been a national scandal and disgrace, is a case in point. The women divided practically as the men did, at an enormous increase in the cost of the election, but with no gain for righteousness and good government.

BEAR IN MIND THAT, EVEN IF CONGRESS HAS BEEN INDUCED TO SUBMIT THE FEDERAL SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT, THE CAUSE OF TRUE WOMANHOOD AND GOOD GOVERNMENT IS NOT WHOLLY LOST. THE NEGATIVE VOTES OF THIRTEEN LEGISLATURES WILL SUFFICE TO PREVENT THE RATIFICATION OF THE AMENDMENT, AND TO GIVE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TIME TO THINK.

A GREAT MASS MEETING IN BOSTON

A PROTEST AGAINST SOCIALISM, BOLSHEVISM AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE

SENATOR J. W. WADSWORTH, JR.,
DAVID GOLDSTEIN, AND EX-
CONGRESSMAN JOHN A.
SULLIVAN THE
SPEAKERS

The great anti-suffrage, anti-Socialism, anti-Bolshevism mass meeting, held in Tremont Temple on the evening of Monday, May 12, under the auspices of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts, afforded convincing proof that the sane public sentiment of the State is as strongly opposed as ever to woman suffrage and the perils that follow in its wake. In spite of unfavorable weather conditions—a heavy downpour of rain—nearly every seat in the great auditorium, floor and both balconies, was filled. About 2,500 persons, one-third of whom were men, listened to and warmly applauded the speakers. There was band music and community singing of patriotic songs, led by Mr. George S. Dane of the War Camp Community Service. Among the anti-suffrage leaders on the platform were Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., President of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, and Mrs. Randolph Frothingham, the newly-elected President of the Massachusetts Association. Mrs. Edwin Ford, who had charge of the arrangements of the meeting, introduced Hon. John A. Sullivan, who presided and made the opening address.

THE SPREAD OF RADICALISM

Mr. Sullivan said that the meeting had been called to protest against the passage of the suffrage amendment by Congress and to voice our indignation and alarm at the spread of radical doctrines throughout the country. We who are opposed to the further extension of woman suffrage, he said, do not assert that suffrage is the cause of this radical thought which is finding such extreme expression, but we do believe that the triumph of woman suffrage would accelerate the pace of Socialism, and that Socialism stands ready to open the door to Bolshevism. We believe that this country and its institutions are worth saving, and we are therefore opposed to the feminism which is the mother of suffrage, the Socialism which is the

handmaid of suffrage, and the Bolshevism which is the illegitimate child of Socialism. Massachusetts is opposed to woman suffrage because it is a manifestation of the spirit of fever and unrest which, if unleashed, will undermine the institutions which have made this Nation honored in the world. Massachusetts, if left to herself, would never accept woman suffrage; it could only come here through the coercion of the other States of the Union.

A FORMER SOCIALIST ATTACKS SOCIALISM

David Goldstein, the next speaker, explained that he was formerly a Socialist, and remained one until he found that it was opposed to Christianity and the Ten Commandments. It is opposed to the home and the ideals of home and the family on which the integrity of the country rests. He pointed out that Socialism, or Bolshevism, had its brief day in Paris in 1871, when the Commune ruled the city, and committed acts like those of the Bolsheviks of today. He explained the Soviet system of government which, he said, is more tyrannical than that of the Czar ever was; and he pointed out that in Russia there is now "woman suffrage with a vengeance, in which every facility is afforded those who desire to get married or divorced, and in which woman is socialized, and her children become the property of the State."

SENATOR WADSWORTH

Senator Wadsworth, who was introduced by Mr. Sullivan as "one Senator who will not sell his birth-right for a mess of pottage," held the attention of the great audience from his first word to the last. If the little groups of suffrage-Socialists, who had several times interrupted Mr. Goldstein—without in the least disturbing him—had planned to "heckle" Senator Wadsworth, they abandoned the plan. The charming personality of the New York Senator, his frank good humor and his evident self-forgetful sincerity gave him full control of the audience from the beginning.

He opened his address by outlining some of the weighty problems with which Congress would have to deal when it reassembled. He condemned the growing power of the Federal Government; and argued that, if the Federal Government kept on taking power from the States and becoming

more and more paternal, the people would lose their own sense of initiative. He criticized the present method of conducting political agitations by means of a concerted and planned propaganda; and said that, if the people should lose the control of self-government, the Government at Washington must perish. One of the things that the people reserved to themselves was the regulation of the franchise. This resolves itself into a question of the right of the people in important communities to govern their own affairs. The proposal now pending in the Federal Amendment is that the states no longer by popular referendum shall be permitted to decide this thing for themselves. Those who are urging the Amendment are intent upon using the Constitution to obtain their own ends. It is surprising how strong is the will to power, and to what lengths it will go.

We cannot logically object to the people themselves voting upon this matter, and we do ask that the people have a chance to vote on it. Is it fair that great commonwealths, containing within their borders at least half of the people of the United States, shall be deprived for all practical purposes of the chance to decide this matter? We stand as adherents of the doctrine that the people shall make of their government anything they please.

There is growing up in this country year by year a paternalistic system which would have shocked our ancestors. The establishment of a bureaucracy is taking place with giant strides in the United States today. Slowly, but surely, with the enactment of one piece of legislation after another we are injecting the government into the daily life of the citizen. Let us learn a lesson from the condition of the German empire, the citizen of which was willing to do everything the government said, and see where the German people are today. We ought to decide how much further we will go along this road. Our ambition should be to keep the government close to us, where we can watch its operations. As to the proposed amendment which would force woman suffrage upon the nation over the heads of the voters, if any group of people understand the value of "self-determination," it is women.

Senator Wadsworth closed his address amid enthusiastic applause; and the meeting closed with the singing of "America."

A BLOW AT POPULAR GOVERNMENT

It was no great thing that the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts asked of the Massachusetts Legislature, when the Federal Suffrage Amendment was submitted for its consideration on the 9th of June.

It was only that the Legislature delay action until measures had been taken for ascertaining the wish of the people at the election next November. All citizens, men and women alike, were to be asked to vote "Yes" or "No" upon the single question, "Shall your representatives be instructed to vote to ratify the amendment to the Federal Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women?"

If this proposal had been adopted, the Legislature of 1920 would have known exactly what the people wanted. The suffragists profess to believe that the sentiment of Massachusetts voters has changed since, less than four years ago, they rejected a suffrage amendment to the State Constitution by a majority of 133,447. If this were true, such a referendum as was proposed would show it. They profess to believe that the majority of Massachusetts women want the ballot. If this were true, the proposed referendum to women would prove it. If the referendum conveyed to the legislators-elect instructions to ratify the amendment, that action might be taken the first week in January, in ample time to allow of the registration and voting of Massachusetts women in the election of 1920.

The bitter opposition of Massachusetts suffragists to any attempt to ascertain the wishes of Massachusetts citizens was proof positive that they knew that the majority of Massachusetts men and women were against them. But the request of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association was so reasonable that a majority of the Committee on Federal Relations, to which the amendment was re-

ferred, after hearing both sides, were in favor of it. But, at this stage, word came to the Committee, from the Governor's office, that he was prepared to veto a referendum bill, if the Legislature should pass it. Thereupon the Committee reversed its action, and voted in favor of immediate ratification. The Senate, by a vote of 8 to 24, defeated the motion for a referendum, and, by a vote of 34 to 5, voted to ratify. The House, by a vote of 67 yeas to 166 nays, defeated the referendum bill, and by a vote of 185 to 47, voted to ratify.

Every Senator and every Representative who voted for ratification knew that he was voting against the expressed wish of his constituency, as well as against the overwhelming majority of the voters of the State, but the promises and threats of the suffragists, and considerations of personal or party advantage, prevailed upon him to disregard every principle of fair play and of popular government. Upon the most revolutionary proposal in the history of the State, the Legislature has dared to apply the steam roller to every expression of the popular will. The 295,939 Massachusetts voters who voted against suffrage in 1915, and carried every city and town in the State, with two trifling exceptions, cannot be expected to forget it.

THE ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts was held on April 29th, in the Swiss room of the Copley-Plaza Hotel, nearly two hundred members being present at the luncheon and business meeting. Miss Julia C. Prendergast was chairman of the Committee of Arrangements. Mrs. Thomas Allen, the president, called the meeting to order, and asked that, before the business of the day was entered upon, all present bow their heads for a moment in silent thanksgiving that the war was over, and a

new era of prosperity for America was about to open.

When Mrs. James M. Codman, the treasurer, rose to read her report, she was greeted with warm applause, because this was the first time in two years, owing to a serious accident, that she had been able to attend a meeting of the Association which she had served, as President or Treasurer, almost ever since its formation. In behalf of the members, Mrs. Allen presented her with a bouquet of orchids, with words of warm appreciation. Mrs. Allen herself, the retiring president, was given a bouquet of sweet peas, with an expression by Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, of the recognition by the Association of her faithful service.

Miss M. Louise Brown reported for the Education and Organization Committee; Mrs. John Balch for the national work; and Mrs. Henry Preston White for the legislative activities which have carried her through many States. Mrs. A. T. Dudley, president of the New Hampshire Association, described the campaign in that State; and Mrs. Herman M. Hubbard, former president of the Ohio Association, and now a resident of Old Lyme, Connecticut, gave an entertaining account of her labors in 1912 and 1919.

Mrs. Randolph Frothingham was elected president to succeed Mrs. Allen, and other officers were chosen as follows:

Vice-presidents, Mrs. John Balch, Mrs. A. H. Parker and Mrs. James D. Colt; honorary vice-presidents, Mrs. George R. Agassiz, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Curtis Guild, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell and Mrs. Henry M. Whitney; treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman; recording secretary, Mrs. Frank Foxcroft; corresponding secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong; executive committee, the officers and Mrs. Thomas Allen, Miss M. Louise Brown, Mrs. James D. Colt, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Eleanor W. Daggett, Mrs. Stephen S. Fitzgerald, Mrs. John F. Hill, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Mrs. Edward Kinsley, Mrs. Herbert Lyman, Mrs. Harold Murdock, Mrs. Benjamin A. Norton, Mrs. Thomas Nelson Perkins, Miss Julia C. Prendergast, Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, Mrs. B. L. Robinson, Miss Evelyn Sears, Mrs. William P. Shreve, Miss Elizabeth P. Sohler, Miss Mabel Stedman, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Mrs. Rudolph Weld, Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Mrs. Henry Preston White and Mrs. J. Bertram Williams.

NOW FOR THE LEGISLATURES

The adoption by both houses of Congress of the resolution to submit the Federal Suffrage Amendment to the States—in the House on the 21st of May by 14 votes more than the required two-thirds of the full membership, and in the Senate on the 4th of June by exactly the required two-thirds—sends the proposal now to the Legislatures of the States.

It is there that the fight must now be fought out to the finish; and anti-suffragists should relax no effort and shrink at no sacrifices to defeat the amendment in the Legislatures. A touching incident of the recent campaign in Texas, which ended in the defeat of the proposed state suffrage amendment by a large majority on the 24th of May, was a generous contribution to the anti-suffrage cause by a California woman, who explained that she had done as much as any one person in that State to bring woman suffrage, "and found the reality so deplorable and dangerous" that she was doing all she could to help to keep it out of other States. That was a magnanimous admission; but no attempted reparation now could retrieve the consequences of her original error. Anti-suffragists in all the States, who want to spare themselves vain regrets, will do everything in their power, and do it quickly, to prevent the ratification of the amendment by the Legislatures.

The suffrage plan of campaign is simple. It is summed up in the one word, "Hurry." The few Legislatures which are now in session will be subjected to strong pressure to ratify the amendment with the least possible delay and the least possible debate. Special sessions will be demanded in States where the Legislatures, under normal conditions, would not convene this year. We shall see time-serving politicians tumbling over each other in their eagerness to meet the suffragist demands.

The simple and reasonable thing for anti-suffragists to do is to insist

upon deliberate action. Legislators who really want to serve the public interest and to be true to their oaths of office will not allow themselves to be pestered by suffragist leaders into doing what neither their consciences nor their judgments approve. They will not be open to suffragist dickers, nor will they be moved by suffragist promises or threats.

The proposed amendment must be brought before the Legislatures of forty-eight States. The adverse action of only thirteen of these States will be sufficient to keep it from becoming effective; and to thwart the suffragist plan of bringing about this revolutionary change over the heads of the people. Courage, determination and persistent effort on the part of those who realize the dangers to the national peace and prosperity involved in this attempt to force woman suffrage upon the country will be sufficient to defeat it.

A JUDICIAL DECISION AGAINST PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE

For the first time, the question of the constitutionality of Presidential suffrage has been submitted to high judicial authority, and an adverse decision rendered.

The question came up in Tennessee, where an injunction was asked for, to prevent the printing of forms for the registration of women voters, and the providing of separate ballot boxes. The complainants claimed that the act of the Legislature giving women Presidential and municipal suffrage was unconstitutional; and this claim was fully sustained in a decision rendered by Chancellor James B. Newman on the 16th of June.

This question cannot be brought before the courts too soon in such States as Minnesota, North Dakota, Wisconsin and Indiana, where the Constitutions expressly restrict the suffrage to male voters, if the country is to be spared bitter contests over

the electoral votes of these States in the election of 1920. The only way to avert this danger to the nation's peace is prompt action to settle, judicially, the validity of such enactments.

Up to date, the constitutionality of Presidential suffrage never has been affirmed in any court.

A ROLL OF HONOR

Massachusetts Senators and Representatives who stood fast, and refused to vote for suffrage against the expressed wish of the people.

A List to be remembered next November

SENATORS

Walter A. Hardy of Fitchburg
Augustus P. Loring of Beverly
Malcolm E. Nichols of Boston
Charles S. Smith of Lincoln
Thomas Weston, Jr., of Newton

REPRESENTATIVES

Essex S. Abbott of Haverhill
Ernest W. Allen of Lynn
Seth F. Arnold of Boston
Josiah Babcock, Jr., of Milton
Francis N. Balch of Boston
George S. Baldwin of Brookline
Herbert A. Bartlett of Brockton
George J. Bates of Salem
Arthur E. Beane of Cambridge
Alfred M. Bessette of New Bedford
Cornelius Boothman of Adams
Albert C. Bray of Buckland
Edgar J. Buck of Warren
William J. Bullock of New Bedford
George F. Butterick of Sterling
Frederic F. Clauss of Cambridge
Benjamin G. Collins of Edgartown
D. Herbert Cook of New Bedford
Henry E. Cowdrey of Fitchburg
George L. Dawley of Westminster
Henry E. Dean of Worcester
Andrew P. Doyle of New Bedford
Horace E. Durgin of Wenham
Joseph W. Ellsworth, Jr., of Barre
Robert T. Fowler of Boston
Charles W. Gould of Milford
Fred. C. Haigis of Montague
Arthur W. Jones of Nantucket
Charles A. Kelley of Worcester
James J. Kelley of Boston
Benjamin C. Lane of Boston
Luther B. Lyman of Medford
George S. Marsh of Hingham
Bernard F. Merriam of Framingham
Julius Meyers of Cambridge
Arthur N. Newhall of Stoneham
Frederic C. Nichols of Fitchburg
Chauncey Pepin of Salem
Frederick E. Pierce of Greenfield
Dennis F. Reardon of Boston
Edward A. Scigliano of Boston
Fitz-Henry Smith, Jr., of Boston
Dexter A. Snow of Westfield
Edward W. Taylor of Lexington
Charles L. Underhill of Somerville
Renton Whidden of Brookline
Isaac U. Wood of Fall River

COMPLICATIONS RAISED BY FEDERAL SUFFRAGE

(Editorial in *Boston Herald*, May 8, 1919)

It is time the easy-going politicians of both parties, who are sanctioning the passage of presidential suffrage bills through state Legislatures, should give some thought to the possibilities involved in this legislation. And we say this wholly without reference to the issue itself.

Not a few of the states in which this action has been taken have provisions in their constitutions expressly limiting the suffrage to male citizens. What is going to happen if it should chance that the result of the presidential election of 1920 should turn upon the vote of one of the states in which women had been given the right to vote through the action of a single Legislature, without a change in the state constitution? Do we really want to precipitate another Hayes-Tilden contest?

Take North Dakota, for example. The constitution of that state describes as qualified electors, "Every male person of the age of 21 years or upwards," and expressly says that "No law extending or restricting the right of suffrage shall be in force until adopted by a majority of the electors of the state voting at a general election." But the North Dakota Legislature paid no attention to this when it enacted presidential suffrage for women.

Or take Indiana. The constitution requiring a two-thirds vote, of that state, provides that "In all elections not otherwise provided for by this constitution, every male citizen, etc."; and the supreme court of that state, called upon to determine the validity of a partial suffrage act, ruled: "That the General Assembly has no authority to extend the right of franchise to persons not included within that definition." This decision related to a partial suffrage bill, relating to local elections as well as to the presidential ballot; and it was the former which the court had directly under review. But the ruling would seem to apply equally to a presidential suffrage bill, pure and simple, such as has been enacted by this year's Legislature.

Or take Minnesota. Article 7 of the Minnesota constitution provides that "every male person of the age of 21 years or upwards" shall, under certain conditions, be entitled to vote "for all offices that now are, or here-

after may be, elective by the people." This in the first section of the article. And in the second section, this: "No person not belonging to one of the classes specified in the preceding section shall be entitled or permitted to vote at any election." Yet this year's Minnesota Legislature did not hesitate to pass a presidential suffrage bill.

Or take Wisconsin, which has just joined the presidential suffrage states, so far as the action of its Legislature goes. The Wisconsin constitution describes as qualified electors "Every male person of the age of 21 years and upwards" belonging to either of three specified classes, and adds: "The Legislature may at any time extend by law the right of suffrage to persons not herein enumerated, but no such law shall be in force until the same shall have been submitted to a vote at a general election and approved by a majority of all votes cast at such election."

The question which we raise, as we said before, is wholly apart from the general question of woman suffrage. It is not surprising that the suffragists are alert to seize every opportunity to advance their cause. But the question for American citizens of both sexes to consider is, what would happen if next year's presidential election should turn on the disputed vote of North Dakota, or Indiana, or Minnesota, or Wisconsin, or any state in which the presidential ballot has been given to women, in apparent conflict with the express provisions of the state constitutions?

A DISPUTED ELECTION

In view of the possibilities involved in the reckless policy of the suffragists in forcing Presidential Suffrage bills, in States whose Constitutions expressly limit the suffrage to male voters, it is timely to remind Americans of the disputed Presidential election of 1876, and the long controversy which followed it.

In that dispute, the result turned, not merely upon the electoral vote of a single State, but upon the vote of a single elector; and the final adjudication of the Electoral Commission, a body specially created with a view to reaching, as far as possible, a non-partisan decision, was that Ruther-

ford B. Hayes of Ohio had received 185 votes for President, against 184 votes for Samuel J. Tilden of New York.

The vote of Oregon was one of those in question. That State was entitled to three electoral votes. Apparently, the Republican ticket was successful at the polls; but the Democratic Governor regarded one of the Republican candidates as ineligible and refused to certify him, giving the certificate to one of the Democratic candidates instead. The Republican electors would not meet with him, and he appointed two other Democrats to act with him. This action the Electoral Commission refused to accept as valid, and ruled that the three electoral votes of the State should be certified in the Republican column.

Four months passed before the investigations of the Commission were concluded, and the result declared. There were apprehensions that the dispute might lead to open revolt; and the partisan dangers of the situation were aggravated by the fact that one branch of Congress was under Democratic control and the other under Republican. But the defeated party and the disappointed candidate, happily, accepted the result without further controversy.

Edward Stanwood, author of the "History of Presidential Elections," closed his chapter on this election, with the remark: "It is to be hoped that the patriotism of the American people and their love of peace may never again be put to such a severe test as was that of 1876 and 1877."

That is a sentiment which all true Americans will endorse. But what would happen if, in the Presidential election of next year, the national result should turn upon the disputed vote of women who had no valid right to vote at all, but who had been given the ballot in violation of the explicit provisions of the Constitution of their States?

Is it wise to pivot such possibilities upon the unregulated caprice of suffrage lobbyists?

COMPULSORY VOTING FOR WOMEN

One of the amendments to the Massachusetts Constitution ratified at the election of 1918 gave the Legislature authority to provide for compulsory voting at elections.

The Legislature has been prompt in endeavoring to use the just-acquired authority. No less than five bills were introduced at this year's session, framed for the purpose of penalizing qualified voters who fail to register, or who, having registered, fail to vote. Such failure, unless justified by affidavits showing illness or absence from the State, is to be treated as a misdemeanor, and punished accordingly, by fines ranging from two to twenty-five dollars.

Most of these bills apply to women as well as to men. The word used in them is not "male" but "person," as, for example, in House bill No. 717.

This bill met the approval of the joint Committee on Election Laws, and was favorably reported. It was intended, presumably, to apply primarily to easy-going men voters, who take the duties of citizenship lightly, and vote or stay away from the polls as the caprice seizes them. But it was probably not an accident that it was so framed, through the use of the word "person," as to cover women who, under the laws of Massachusetts, are qualified to register and vote for school committee, but not more than four per cent of whom—on the average—avail themselves of that privilege, or perform that duty, as we may choose to describe it. The purpose of the projected legislation is, in a word, to change the privilege of voting into a duty,—and a duty which the law intends sternly to enforce.

Such legislation changes the whole aspect of the woman suffrage agitation. Hitherto, it has been possible for the suffragists to say to legislators and to the public, "Women who do not want to vote have no right to prevent those who do want to."

It may be hoped that we shall now

have an end to this sort of talk. It must now be seen that the suffrage is not a trifling matter, which can be attended to in a few minutes "on the way to market," and which women who do not want it ought not to begrudge to those who do, but a serious responsibility, which the State intends that all persons qualified for it shall meet regularly, or be punished if they do not.

It is little less than a crime to impose such a burden as this, with its attendant penalties, upon all Massachusetts women, at the strident demand of an acknowledged minority.

SUFFRAGE STATES IN NO HURRY TO RATIFY

According to dispatches from the Governors of various suffrage States, in the *New York Tribune* of June 9, it appears that they are in no hurry to convene special sessions of their Legislatures to ratify the Federal amendment. The Governor of North Dakota states that the next regular session convenes in January, 1921; and gives no hint of a special session. The Governor of Nevada is loath to call a special session, but states that the Legislature will certainly ratify the amendment at the next regular session of 1921, if not sooner. The Secretary of Oklahoma states that the amendment cannot be considered before January, 1921, when action will be favorable. The Governor of Wyoming explains that the Legislature will not meet until 1921, and that no special session will be called, as the expense of such a session is not justified. The Acting Governor of Washington says that he will not call a special session needlessly, and that the Legislature will not convene before January, 1921, unless it appears that its vote is absolutely necessary to secure the ratification of the amendment before the 1920 election.

Altogether, it appears that the Governors of suffrage States are not tumbling over each other in their haste to fasten suffrage upon other States through a Federal amendment.

THE PUBLIC INTERESTS LEAGUE

The Public Interests League of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts held its annual meeting at 687 Boylston Street on the 11th of June, and elected the following officers:

President, Mrs. B. L. Robinson; vice-presidents, Mrs. F. B. Sanborn and Mrs. Edwin Ford; recording secretary, Miss Adelaide Proctor; corresponding secretary, Mrs. Charles B. Gulick; treasurer, Miss Evelyn Sears; executive committee, Miss Eleanor Allen, Mrs. John Balch, Mrs. Arthur E. Brown, Miss Margaret Dexter, Miss Maida Falvey, Miss Heloise E. Hershey, Mrs. Edmund S. Kelley, Mrs. Edward Kinsley, Miss Georgiana Lane, Mrs. Herbert Lyman, Miss Margaret J. Maher, Mrs. J. T. Mooney, Miss Lavinia Newell, Miss Mary Parker, Miss Julia C. Prendergast, Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, Mrs. Elliott Robbins, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Mrs. Matthew Sullivan, Mrs. George R. Wallace, Mrs. Henry Preston White and Mrs. Geoffrey G. Whitney.

The League endorsed unanimously a new activity, called "the 100 per cent. American movement" and undertook to get the signatures of both men and women to its platform, which declares:

"The Socialist movement is a serious menace to American institutions and the attempt of the suffragists to overthrow representative government and to destroy majority rule shows them to be enemies of democracy."

A GLOOMY VIEW OF SUFFRAGE PROSPECTS

(From the *New York American*, *Suffrage-Socialist*, June 6)

With two votes to spare, the woman suffrage Constitutional amendment passed the Senate. Thirty-six States must now vote for the amendment to put it in the Constitution. It is not pleasant to say, but it is probable that thirty-six States will NOT vote for justice to women.

Some States fear their colored women: say they can control colored men, not colored women. Others fear their white women: say they haven't brains enough to share in making laws. It is probable that this Constitutional amendment will be defeated by the States; and that women will be compelled to continue their fight State by State.

"PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE" A DANGEROUS TRAP

The REMONSTRANCE reprints elsewhere an editorial article from the *Boston Herald*, pointing out the dangerous possibilities to the peace of the nation, which are involved in the passage of unconstitutional presidential suffrage bills. The article deserves the consideration of every thoughtful American citizen.

"The question for American citizens of both sexes to consider," says the *Herald*, "is, what would happen if next year's presidential election should turn on the disputed vote of North Dakota, or Indiana, or Minnesota, or Wisconsin, or any other state in which the presidential ballot has been given to women, in apparent conflict with the express provisions of the state constitutions."

We are approaching a Presidential election, which promises to be one of the closest and most bitterly contested in the history of the country. It may easily happen that the result may turn upon the electoral vote of a single state. In 1876, as the REMONSTRANCE reminds its readers in another article, it turned upon the vote of a single elector, and was settled only after months of agitation and uncertainty, and then by devising a new and dubious piece of electoral machinery. What sane American would wish to have a like emergency arise in 1920, turning upon the votes of women to whom the Constitution of their States denied the right to vote? Yet that is precisely the emergency toward which we are being hurried by reckless suffrage leaders, and easy-going politicians. That is the trap which is being set for us by the Presidential suffrage bills.

So many exciting events have occurred in the interval that it is probable that a good many Americans have forgotten how close was the last Presidential election. The result was in doubt for days, and when the final count was made, it was found that President Wilson had been reelected

by 277 electoral votes, against 254 for Mr. Hughes,—a margin of only 23 votes. A shifting of only 12 electoral votes from one column to another would have been enough to force Mr. Wilson into retirement, and to put Mr. Hughes in his place.

Now, suppose that the result were to be equally close in 1920, and suppose that Minnesota were to be the pivotal State. It happens that Minnesota has exactly 12 votes in the Electoral College. As the *Herald* states, the Constitution of Minnesota expressly provides, in its 7th article, that "every male person of the age of 21 years or upwards" shall, under certain conditions, be entitled to vote "for all offices that now are, or hereafter may be, elective by the people" and Section 2 of the same article provides that "no person not belonging to one of the classes specified in the preceding section shall be entitled or permitted to vote at any election."

It would be impossible to define a principle more clearly than in these words. Yet the Minnesota suffragists have just persuaded the Minnesota Legislature, in defiance of this provision of the State Constitution, to enact a bill conferring on women the right to vote for Presidential Electors. In other words, a bill hurried through a single Legislature, gives to women a right which the Constitution of the State expressly says they shall not have.

The possible consequences of this reckless legislation are the more clear when it is realized how close is the division of parties in that State. The total Republican and Democratic vote at the last Presidential election was 358,696; and the Republican plurality, which carried with it the 12 Electoral votes of the State, was only three hundred and ninety-two.

Suppose that, next year, by a like handful of votes, the State were to be carried one way or the other; and that the 12 Electoral votes to which the State is entitled were to be enough to decide the national result.

The question as to who was elected President would then turn upon the votes of women who, under the State Constitution, were not entitled and should not have been permitted to vote.

It would seem that even the most frenzied suffragists would hesitate before inviting such a catastrophe as that. But, as it is evidently too much to expect reason or moderation or patriotism from them, at least the Legislatures which are urged to take so mad a step should refuse to run so great a risk.

It is somewhat reassuring to find that the serious character of the peril which the Minnesota Legislature has invited is appreciated in that State. For example, the *Minnesota Tribune*, a journal favorable to woman suffrage, says:

"In no State has the elective franchise been more definitely limited to males than in Minnesota.

"It is true that the Federal Constitution provides that each State may appoint, in such manner as the Legislature shall direct, its presidential electors, but it does not provide that these electors may be appointed or elected in a manner inconsistent with any State constitution.

"The validity of this proposed law will undoubtedly be tested in the courts, for it certainly ought to be before the results of any election are complicated by a question of the constitutionality of the law under which the election was held. *If the law should be found to be unconstitutional it might very easily affect the election of the President.*"

AMONG the Governors who decline to call special sessions of their Legislatures, to carry out the suffrage scheme of immediate ratification, are Governor Cooper of South Carolina, Governor Holcomb of Connecticut, Governor Clement of Vermont, and Governor Black of Kentucky. Governor Catts of Florida strongly urged the Legislature to ratify, but the Legislature promptly turned his message down, and adjourned.

RATIFICATION MAY BE RESCINDED

It should be borne in mind that, at any time prior to the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution by the Legislatures of thirty-six States, any Legislature which has committed itself to that action or any later Legislature in that State, is perfectly free to rescind the ratification. This was done by the Legislature of New York in 1870, with reference to the Fifteenth Amendment.

In Massachusetts, for example, if the Legislature to be chosen next November, and beginning its sessions next January, should be inclined to reverse the precipitate and ill-advised action of the present Legislature, it will be entirely at liberty to do so.

This must not be forgotten.

SUFFRAGE DEFEAT IN TEXAS

The proposed suffrage amendment to the Texas Constitution went down to a smashing defeat at the election on May 24. At last accounts, with some counties not yet recorded, the adverse majority was 25,029, with a likelihood that it might reach 30,000 in the complete, official returns.

This is a bitter disappointment to the suffragists, who had assumed that, as the Texas Legislature had inflicted a primary suffrage law upon the State, after the Arkansas pattern, the adoption of full suffrage by constitutional amendment would be an easy matter. They had counted, moreover, on the difficulty which the anti-suffragists would experience in covering the huge territory of the State with an effective campaign. To make assurance, as they assumed, doubly sure, they had tied up the suffrage amendment with a clause disfranchising aliens, making it impossible for the voters to separate the two issues. Also, they made false accusations of an alliance between the anti-suffragists and the saloon interests, and tried to prove their charges by tricky, manufactured evidence.

But all their schemes failed. The anti-suffragists covered the State with a clean and energetic campaign, and were rewarded by a splendid victory.

SUFFRAGE DEFEATED IN CONNECTICUT

Connecticut suffragists experienced a double disappointment this year. Their presidential suffrage bill, after passing the House, was defeated in the Senate; and the proposed suffrage amendment to the State constitution, which had been acted on favorably by the House in 1917, was abandoned because it was so drawn that, according to an opinion given by ex-Governor Simeon E. Baldwin, its effect would have been not only to strike out the sex requirement, but the words requiring voters to read in English.

No suffragist has been found who had the courage to "point with pride" to the Chicago mayoralty election of April 1 as evidence of "uplift" through women's votes. The women divided exactly as the men did. The percentage of women voters who voted to perpetuate the disgraceful administration of Mayor Thompson was even larger than the percentage of men voters who took the same stand. And on the question of closing the saloons, the women voted "wet" by a majority of 48,406. Out of 656,000 women eligible to vote, 400,336 did not appear at the polls, being unmoved by the chance to rid the city of Thompson, or that of closing the saloons. The *Woman Citizen* wisely refrains from comment.

ALTHOUGH New Zealand has had woman suffrage for many years, New Zealanders do not care to have any Jeannette Rankins in their Parliament. The provision which forbids women to be candidates for either branch has been steadily maintained from the beginning, and an attempt made this winter to change it met with gloomy failure.

IN Ohio, under a decision rendered by Judge E. B. Dillon of the Franklin County Common Pleas Court, on the 19th of June, the right of Ohio voters to approve or disapprove the action of the State Legislature in ratifying constitutional amendments is affirmed. Unless this decision is reversed by higher courts, there will be a referendum on the suffrage amendment. One can guess what will happen in that case, for, the last time that Ohio voters voted on the suffrage question—no longer ago than 1917—they gave a majority of 146,120 against.

NO TIME TO QUIT

(Editorial in *New York World*, June 7)

Do anti-suffragists intend to give up the fight just because they have met with one reverse, serious though that may be? . . . This is no time to quit, but rather to reopen hostilities with renewed vigor and to carry the war into Africa. Though the suffragists have won the Senate, they have not won the legislatures. They have thirty-six States to gain before they come into the promised land, while the Antis have only thirteen to secure to defeat the amendment, and of these many are more than half persuaded not to grant the ballot to women under any conditions.

THE RIGHTS OF STATES

(Editorial in *Hartford Courant*, June 7)

Connecticut stands for the rights of the States. Her two Senators on Wednesday voted for the self-respect and the rights of Connecticut. They were outvoted, but they stood for their State and did not fall in with the scramble for votes.

Governor Holcomb says there is no reason for calling a special session of the General Assembly, but, if he did call one, the members, if they voiced Connecticut opinion, would vote against ratification.

* * * * *

The *Courant* believes in equal pay for equal work, whoever does it, man or woman, and for fair treatment of all citizens, without regard to sex. Its objection to loading women with the responsibilities and burden of the ballot begins with the belief that they do not want it.